

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 10-22, and 28-41 were rejected by the Examiner in the above-identified Office Action. In response, claims 1-3, 14-18, 21-22, 28, and 32 have been amended, claims 33-41 have been cancelled. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure, no new matter has been introduced.

Accordingly, claims 1-4, 10-22, and 28-32 are now pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4, 10-22 and 28-41 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,850,548 to Williams (hereinafter, Williams). In response, notwithstanding Applicant disagreement with the Examiner's analysis, Applicant has cancelled claims 33-41, without prejudice, and amended claims 1-3, 14-18, 21-22, 28, and 32 to more clearly recite Applicant's invention. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 10-22 and 28-32 are in condition of allowance.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cited col. 11, lines 29-40 of Williams as teaching the recitation "rendering a first action cell nested within one of said first and second display container cells, the first action cell being associated with causing at least a first action to be performed in association with or on behalf of at least one of a third display container cell and a fourth display container cell," which has now been amended to further recite "*the first action being performed in response to a user selection of the first action cell, and the first, second, third and fourth display container cells being different display container cells.*"

As quoted by the Examiner, col 11, lines 29-40 state: "The user accesses the VisualComponents3 (i.e., access to its internal properties) by adding a new property to the component, as shown in Fig 6c. The user request property inspection of the Slider 651 which appears in the visual editor 650 (e.g. by right clicking on it with a mouse cursor). In response, the system display pop-up menu 652. The user

may instruct the system to create a new property by selecting "New Property" menu choice 653. The system, in response, displays a Property Object 654 as shown in Fig. 6d. Here, the user can type in a New Property, such as "Value" 655. Now, Value 655 is a property which may be accessed from outside the component."

The passage is associated with adding a new property to a "component" selected by a designer in the course of designing an application using the components provided by the disclosed visual application development environment. A component under Williams, as clearly defined in col. 3, lines 50-57, is a "Fundamental System Unit. Does all processing; receives and send messages. In an exemplary embodiments, "atomic" or "sub-components" will typically be created in a high level programming language, such as C++ or Pascal. "Composite" or "super components" on the other hand, will typically be created using visual programming or scripting techniques." Thus, elements 620 and 625 of Fig 6c are icon representations of the components having been selected for inclusion into the application being designed. Nothing in Williams teaches that "on user selection of" one of these 620 or 625 icon representations, an "action" will be performed "in association with or on behalf of a third or fourth display container cell" (that are different from a first or second display container cells within which the icon representation 620 or 625 is rendered).

Element 650 is a window of visual editor that facilitates the designer in adding property to the selected component 625. Element 651 is an icon representation of the Slider property. Element 652 is a pop-up menu. Elements 653 are choices within the pop-up menu. Element 652 (having elements 653) is displayed in response to a "right click" while the cursor is in hovering over element 651. As is well known to those of ordinary skill, right click is NOT selection of an icon. Right click conventionally is a technique through which a user asks the system for a list of selections associated with the icon. In the example, the list of selections are the property choices available under the property menu. Thus, none of these elements teach "an action cell" where "on user selection of" one of these 650, 651, 652, 653 window, icon representation, menu list or menu entry, an "action" will be performed "in association with or on behalf of a third or fourth display container cell" (that are

different from a first or second display container cells within which the icon representation of the element is rendered).

Similarly, element 654 is merely a data entry field allowing the user to enter “value” 655 for a selected property.

Thus, Applicant submits nothing in this passage or anywhere in Williams teaches the recited “action cell” of claim 1, which is

- “nested within one of said first and second display container cells,”
- “associated with causing at least a first action to be performed in association with or on behalf of at least one of a third display container cell and a fourth display container cell (that are different from the first or the second display container cell within which the action cell is rendered;” and
- “the first action being performed in response to a user selection of the first action cell”

Applicant’s position is clearly supported by Willaim’s own admission about its Graphical User (Windowing) Interface, which as admitted in col. 5, lines 1-30, is a conventional GUI with windows that are rectangular. The windows may be tiled or cascaded. At the top of a window is a menu bar, with user command choices, each of which may invoke additional submenus and software tools for use with application objects (within the window). Nothing in Williams description of its own GUI suggests anything but a conventional GUI.

§102 rejections require that the cited reference to clearly and unequivocally discloses each and every recited element of the claimed invention. Since Williams failed to teach at least one recitation of claim 1, Applicant submits claim 1 is patentable over Williams.

Amended claim 28 includes recitations similar to those of amended claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claim 28 is patentable over Williams.

Claims 2-4, 10-22, and 29-32 depend from either claim 1 or 28, incorporating their recitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 2-4, 10-22, and 29-32 are patentable over Williams.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, claims 1-4, 10-22, and 28-32 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 381-8813.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: May 12, 2009

by: /Al AuYeung/
Al AuYeung
Reg. No. 35,432

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981